

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

In the specification, paragraph [0032] has been amended.

Claims 17, 19, 37, and 39 are requested to be cancelled. Claims 1, 18, 20, 21, 38, 40, 41, and 45 are currently being amended. No claims are being added. Accordingly, claims 1-16, 18, 20-26, 38, and 40-48 are submitted for reconsideration

A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

In the claim amendments, claims 1 and 21 have been amended to incorporate the recitations of canceled claims 19 and 39, respectively, and claims 41 and 45 have been amended to incorporate a recitation analogous to the recitation of canceled claim 19.

In the Office Action, the disclosure was objected to under MPEP § 608.01 for containing an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. Applicant has amended paragraph [0032] so that it no longer contains an embedded hyperlink. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the objection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-3, 7-16, 20-23, 27-36, 40-42, and 45-46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eck (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0129059) in view of Cheng-Hung (U.S. Patent No. 6,397,232). In addition, claims 17-19 and 37-39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eck in view of Cheng-Hung, and in further view of the Microsoft Computer Dictionary, Fifth Edition.

Claim 1, as amended to incorporate the recitation of canceled claim 19, recites that a method for translating between an XML-type document and a first type of document, comprises generating a data model for the XML-type document based on an XML data source, generating a data model for the first type of document based on the XML data source,

and creating mapping rules between the data model for the XML-type document and the data model for the first type of document. The method further comprises verifying that the XML-type document is well-formed based upon the data model for the XML-type document.

Eck discloses that test data is created after the source and target models have been created (§ [0117]). If an XML message is used as the input, then there is no need to generate test data because the user already has the XML message to use as test data, and the XML message typically is better quality test data than can be generated based on default properties (§ [0122]). Nevertheless, test data can be generated by generating an XML message (§ [0123]).

In particular, Eck discloses that the test generation process takes the Source XML Model, searches for a first defining item (the lowest level of a definition, such as <First Name> in the previous example), and then searches/detects the properties of the defining item in the model and automatically creates data that matches the detected properties and structure of the defining element (§ [0123]). For example, to define the item <First Name>, having the properties set forth in the Source Model of data type=alpha, random characters would be created that match these properties and structure, i.e., the test data for <First Name> could be “aaaaa” (§ [0123]). Further, every defining item in the Source Model would be detected in this manner, and test data generated in the same way (§ [0123]).

In the rejection of claim 19, it is asserted that Eck discloses verifying that the XML-type document is well formed based upon the data model for the XML type document with reference to paragraph [0123]. In contrast to the assertion, Eck merely discloses that “test data” is generated based on a source model. There is no disclosure or suggestion in Eck of verifying that the XML-type document is well formed based on the data model for the XML type document, as recited in claim 1. Rather, Eck merely discloses generating test data based on the model, and in fact contrasts the generation of the test data with the use of the existing XML message purported to be better suited for use as test data (see § [0122]). Eck, however, does not disclose or suggest any verification that the existing XML message is well formed.

Even if combinable, Cheng-Hung fails to cure the deficiencies of Eck. Like Eck, Cheng-Hung fails to disclose or suggest verifying that the XML-type document is well formed based upon the data model for the XML type document. Accordingly, even if combinable, claim 1 is patentably distinguishable from the combination of Eck and Cheng-Hung.

Claims 2-3, 7-16, 18, and 20 are patentably distinguishable from the combination of Eck and Cheng-Hung by virtue of their dependence from claim 1, as well as their additional recitations. Claims 21, 41, and 45 are patentably distinguishable from the combination of Eck and Cheng-Hung for reasons analogous to claim 1. Claims 22-23, 27-36, 38, 40, 42, and 46 are patentably distinguishable from the combination of Eck and Cheng-Hung by virtue of their dependence from claim 21, 41, or 45, as well as their additional recitations.

The remaining claims 4-6, 24-26, 43-44, and 47-48 were rejected by the combination of Eck and Cheng-Hung and further in view of Webber (U.S. Patent No. 6,418,400), Huang (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0147748), or De La Huerga (U.S. Patent No. 6,516,321). Like Eck and Cheng-Hung, none of these references discloses or suggests verifying that the XML-type document is well formed based upon the data model for the XML type document. Accordingly, even if combinable, claims 4-6, 24-26, 43-44, and 47-48 are patentably distinguishable from the asserted combinations by virtue of their dependency from claims 1, 21, 41, and 45, respectively, as well as their additional recitations.

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to

Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 11/6/05

By 

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 672-5485
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

William T. Ellis
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 26,874